

System Configuration Team (SCT)

Reasonable & Prudent Measure #26 Meeting Notes June 21, 2001

Greetings and Introductions.

The June 21 meeting of the System Configuration Team was held at the National Marine Fisheries Service offices in Portland, Oregon. The meeting was chaired by Bill Hevlin of NMFS and facilitated by Richard Forester. The agenda and a list of attendees for the June 21 meeting are attached as Enclosures A and B.

The following is a distillation (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed at the meeting, together with actions taken on those items. Please note that some enclosures referenced may be too lengthy to routinely include with the meeting notes; copies of all enclosures referred to in the minutes are available upon request from Kathy Ceballos of NMFS at 503/230-5420.

1. Minutes from the April and May SCT Meetings.

Hevlin asked that the other SCT members provide any comments they may have on the draft minutes to him by July 27.

2. Portland District FFDRWG Update.

Mike Langsley of the Corps distributed a summary of items discussed at the most recent Portland District FFDRWG meeting (this summary is attached as Enclosure C); he went briefly through this document, touching on adult PIT detection work, Bonneville adult fallback, John Day ESBS, John Day end-bay deflectors and removable spillway weir, John Day south ladder exit improvements, The Dalles combined system, The Dalles surface collection prototype evaluation, The Dalles survival studies, The Dalles spillway improvement study, Bonneville corner collector, Bonneville PH2 FGE, gas abatement and Bonneville gas fasttrack.

3. Status of the B1 Decision Document – Update.

John Kranda distributed an update on the status of the B1 decision document (attached as Enclosure D). He said there was another meeting of the B1 Decision Document subcommittee on May 31. At that meeting, the subcommittee participants reached agreement on the following Bonneville configuration and operational decisions: that B2 will be the priority; that the B2 corner collector will be implemented, that study will continue on B2 FGE improvements, and that those improvements will be implemented if justified. It was also agreed that a fix at B1 must eventually be implemented, but that B1 is a lower priority than B2. There was also agreement that the B1 JBS/ESBS is the appropriate choice for B1, given the information in hand at this time. Cost concerns and the high-flow outfall issue are the main reasons B1 was considered a lower priority, Tom Lorz noted.

Kranda said future spill levels, once the new configuration items are in place, remain to be discussed; the next meeting of the B1 Decision Document subgroup was set for July 20. The plan is to distribute the draft decision document no later than July 6, he said; the goal is to finalize the decision document by the end of August, including an SCT briefing some time in August. The decision document will be made available for ISRP review in early September.

Kranda added that the Corps expects to modify an existing contract for removal of the existing PSC prototype at B1 in August or September 2001, with removal to take place during the '01/'02 in-water work window; the cost of that work is about \$800,000, and funds are available. Tom Lorz suggested that it may make more sense to leave this structure in place from the standpoint of interim fish passage benefits; it was agreed that Lorz will raise this issue at the next B1 Decision Document subgroup meeting. Kranda said that, from a contractual standpoint, it would be acceptable to discuss this issue at that meeting.

4. Status of the FY'01 CRFM Budget – Update.

Kranda said there is little new to report on this front; he distributed the most recent version of the FY'02 CRFM measures spreadsheet (which includes budgetary data for fiscal years '01-'05), but said the FY'01 numbers have changed little, if at all. We're still looking to use all of our savings and slippage in FY'01, which will put us at about \$82 million for the year; he said. The most recent savings and slippage installment, \$1.6 million, is coming. Another \$600,000 in savings and slippage is still forthcoming, said Kranda; it looks as though that is all we'll need to finish out the year. Once that final payment arrives, he said, the numbers will be quite similar to what's shown on this spreadsheet.

Mike Mason added that the President has requested a supplement to the FY'01 budget; that supplement includes \$10.7 million for the Lower Monumental stilling basin erosion repairs. The supplement has made it through the House subcommittee, Mason said; if those funds are

approved, in-water work will begin in July of 2002 in order to complete repairs in time for the

2003 outmigration.

5. Prioritization of Measures in the Corps' FY'02 CRFM Program.

Hevlin distributed Enclosure F, a document titled "SCT Criteria and Guidelines for Prioritization of the FY'02 CRFM program." He drew the group's attention to Page 2 of this handout, "BiOp Priorities (Test Scheme)," noting that this list was distributed at the May SCT meeting, and that he had requested comments from the SCT. The comments received are included as pp. 3-4 of Enclosure F.

In an attempt to address everyone's comments, said Hevlin, I re-worked the criteria list (on Page 1 of Enclosure F). The group devoted a lengthy discussion to the comments received and the changes he made to this list in response to those comments. The goal, said Hevlin, is to reach agreement on what these criteria should be at today's meeting. He noted that Washington, which was not represented at today's meeting, has already given its preliminary approval for this list of criteria.

Various modifications, additions and deletions were made to the list of criteria in the course of this discussion. Is it the pleasure of the group to adopt these guidelines at today's meeting, or are additional modifications needed? Forester asked. Lorz said that, while this list looks acceptable to him, as modified, he will need to check with others in his office before making CRITFC's approval official. No additional objections were raised to the modified criteria list. Forester then observed that there is SCT consensus on the acceptability of these criteria, with one abstention – CRITFC's. Mallette observed that Idaho was not present for today's discussion. Hevlin replied that he would attempt to contact Steve Pettit, Idaho's representative, prior to the next SCT meeting and that Steve would receive the work from today's meeting.

With preliminary agreement on the criteria reached, the group begin to apply the criteria to the individual line-items in the FY'02 CRFM spreadsheet. To initiate this work, Hevlin introduced a strawman list of line-items (Enclosure H) which he considered meeting one or more of the five high priority criteria and proposed that the group discuss the items project by project and either agree or raise discussion / objections. Enclosure G includes the specific RPA or RPAs each line-item is intended to satisfy; Enclosure H notes which of the high-priority criteria are applicable to each line-item. The remainder of the meeting was spent working through Enclosures G and H, flagging those line items in which there was preliminary agreement that the item met one or more of the high priority criteria, and listing those line items lacking agreement and termed as sit-asides for further discussion. The results of the meeting's prioritization work will be documented in the facilitators notes, distributed within a week, and comments are to be directed to Hevlin and Kranda prior to the next meeting. Kranda will develop a cumulative budget spreadsheet of the high priorities, sit-asides and additions prior to the next meeting,

where we will continue prioritization of the remaining line-items into the medium and low

priority categories.

6. Next SCT Meeting Date.

The next meeting of the System Configuration Team was set for Thursday, July 26 starting at 9 a.m. Meeting notes prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.